UNITED
NATIONS

E

Economic and Social
Council

PROVISIONAL

E/1994/SR.15
2 November 1994
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

Substantive session for 1994

High-level segment

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 15th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 29 June 1994, at 6 p.m.

President: Mr. BUTLER (Australia)

CONTENTS

AN AGENDA FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference Services, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza.

The meeting was called to order at 6.15 p.m.

AN AGENDA FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued) (A/48/935)

Mr. RAKOTONDRAMBOA (Madagascar), endorsed the statement of the representative of Algeria on behalf of the Group of 77 and emphasized the importance of an agenda for development as a necessary corollary to the Agenda for Peace introduced two years earlier by the Secretary-General. In a world where the economic and social lot of a large majority of the population continued to deteriorate it was now more timely than ever to define new strategies and to agree on the parameters and machinery that would reduce the inequalities of the world economic system. That objective should be pursued not on the basis of North-South confrontation, but through constructive dialogue and political commitment to create a true and equitable partnership to tackle the major economic and social problems confronting the developing countries.

His delegation shared the belief that an agenda for development should be aimed above all at eliminating poverty, meeting the basic needs of the peoples of the developing world and raising their level of living. It also believed that the close interdependence of the five dimensions of development described in the Secretary-General's report must be recognized and that international action should fully address the challenges stemming from the negative effects of structural adjustment policies.

Globalization and the increasing interdependence of the world's economies and their key sectors highlighted the need for a global, integrated and unified approach. Those same phenomena also confirmed the necessity of achieving effective coordination of international cooperation activities among the agents of development, including the Bretton Woods institutions, so as to avoid perpetuating the marginalization of the countries of the South, and corroborated the need to restructure the institutional framework which governed international economic relations.

An agenda for development should make it possible to reaffirm the role of the United Nations as a central forum for reflection and debate, given its universal character and the democratic principles that governed it. The agenda

should promote an effective and rapid implementation of previous commitments and take into consideration the objectives of forthcoming international conferences dealing with economic and social development. It should recommend specific actions and provide for more vigorous measures reflecting awareness of the dangers that threatened all of mankind.

The specific proposals made by the Group of 77 deserved to be considered in depth. They concerned, in particular, trade liberalization, mobilization of financial resources, the external debt problem, strengthening of scientific and technological capacity, and support for South-South cooperation activities and regional economic integration efforts. Particular attention should be given to the critical situation of Africa and to the specific needs of the least developed countries.

Mr. LOPEZ de CHICHERI (Spain) said that, like the representative of Greece, who had spoken on behalf of the European Union, he supported the general ideas contained in the Secretary-General's report, which defined five pillars or dimensions of development. It was now necessary to define specific measures to be adopted in order to transform the agenda for development into a document that focused more on operational activities. The restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the Organization constituted an important step in that direction. That course should be pursued and it should be ascertained whether it would be advisable to expand the functions of the Economic and Social Council. The question of development should be granted the highest priority.

On the basis of the Secretary-General's report, special recommendations which took particular situations into account should be formulated, for the model for development, which could be neither uniform nor unique, should be based on the cultural heritage and dynamic forces of each society. His delegation wished to recall, as it had done when the topic was being considered by the Second Committee of the General Assembly in December 1993, that the 21 Heads of State and Government who had met at the third Ibero-American Summit held in Salvador, Brazil, on 15 and 16 July 1993, had approved, in part one of the final document, an agenda for development which emphasized social development (A/48/291, annex).

The fourth Ibero-American Summit, held in Cartagena, Colombia, on 14 and 15 June, had concluded that in order to achieve the objective of integrated economic and social development, it was necessary to promote regional

integration processes, through agreements for free trade and economic complementarity, preferential systems or other advanced forms of integration, unilateral access measures and administrative streamlining and by strengthening the new multilateral rules governing trade. For the Ibero-American countries, trade and integration were two fundamental elements of development, which should contain a significant social component.

However, regionalization should not minimize the Organization's capacity to find an integrated solution to the political, socio-economic, humanitarian and environmental problems raised by development world wide. In that regard, his delegation shared the view expressed by the Secretary-General in his report to the effect that the United Nations system was well placed to channel, coordinate and adopt measures to promote equitable and sustainable development. The International Conference on Population and Development, to be held in Cairo in September 1994, the Fourth World Conference on Women, to be held in Beijing in 1995 and the World Summit for Social Development, to be held in March 1995, would certainly provide an opportunity to develop those issues in greater depth by way of constructive and effective dialogue. As part of the preparation for the World Summit, his delegation had just submitted a national report containing proposals aimed at improving the Organization's activities relating to the promotion of social development.

Mr. da COSTA (Angola) observed that the end of the cold war had brought neither peace nor development and that the profound changes which had occurred had engendered new and serious problems for the international community. The developing countries continued to confront an unfavourable external climate and to find that their development efforts were encumbered by increasing uncertainty and outside intervention. Despite their constant efforts to readjust their economies, development was an objective that was becoming increasingly overlooked in the context of international cooperation. In the current post-cold-war period, new political factors were influencing international cooperation for development. The world economy was currently directed by a minority of countries and by non-universal financial institutions. International economic relations should be made more democratic.

Peace, the economy, the environment, justice and democracy were the pillars of development. Economic problems should be addressed from a world perspective given the growing interdependence of countries, which meant that the effects of

positive and negative factors were felt more rapidly. No State could remain detached from the demographic, environmental, economic, social and military problems facing the world. The effects of poverty, illness and conflicts to which one or another region fell victim, were felt in other regions as well; those effects could not be eliminated without global development. The interplay of economic, diplomatic and military forces as well as the implicit or explicit conditions posed in connection with financial and commercial assistance, significantly reduced the freedom of the developing countries to design their own development policies.

An agenda for development should apply to all countries and the responsibilities of the North and the South should be specified for each area of activity. He believed that the inequality of wealth was so great that structural adjustment was necessary for the countries of the North, as well as those of the South. Thus far, structural adjustment had been more productive in the former than in the latter. If it disregarded the dominance of the large developed countries, an agenda for development would not contribute to the attainment of the chosen objective. An agenda for development should be aimed at reviving economic growth in the developing countries by enabling them to adopt measures to promote sustainable development and economic growth. It should ensure that all countries, regardless of their size, wealth, or strength, participated on equal footing in the world economy. An agenda for development should propose specific and effective measures aimed at enhancing the role of the United Nations in development and according that question the same importance as the maintenance of international peace and security. Peace-keeping operations should not be promoted at the expense of development activities. Furthermore, the Organization should endeavour to better meet the financial and institutional needs of the developing countries.

Rather than erect lofty theories, it was essential to attack the real problems of development or, rather, of non-development, which were obvious in Africa. His delegation recognized that the countries of the European Union were assisting African countries and had opened their market to African products. In recent years, the economic and social situation on the African continent had deteriorated (owing to debt, excessive dependence on primary commodities, rapid population growth, malnutrition, environmental degradation, drought and desertification, political instability and internal conflicts), even as it had

become more marginalized in the world economy. The situation was even more alarming in sub-Saharan Africa, where poverty and human suffering had attained proportions unknown elsewhere. The economies of the African countries must be transformed and diversified if they were to become integrated in the world economy, reduce their dependence and begin a process of self-sustained growth. Without diversified economic development, Africa would be unable to find a lasting solution to its social problems and internal conflicts or to experience true and lasting peace.

Mr. BATU (Turkey) recalled that one of the purposes of the United Nations was to achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic and social character. The Charter entrusted the Organization with as important a role in the economic and social fields as in other fields. The demands of the post-cold-war period and efforts to establish a new world order had inevitably led the international community to focus on areas of tension and had resulted in the strengthening of the role of the United Nations in the field of international peace and security. With the agenda for development, the time had come to re-examine the merits of the Organization as the institutional framework for international cooperation in the economic and social sectors.

The experience of the past 20 years had shown that economic growth alone did not guarantee development. He emphasized the need to attain sustainable growth and to link economic and social factors and objectives at all stages, in particular with regard to policy-making. He agreed with the Secretary-General that the five dimensions of development must be interlinked in order to achieve sustainable development. However, economic growth was the engine of development and without such growth, measures to divide the fruits of development among all members of society would have, at best, only a minimal impact.

In paragraph 46 of his report (A/48/935), the Secretary-General rightly stressed that for sustained growth to take place, two conditions were necessary: a supportive national environment, and a favourable international climate. By recognizing that development was a global issue and that all countries would derive economic and social benefits from balanced development, the agenda for development could help to create a favourable international climate. However, the following points should be studied in greater depth and developed further: the impact of technological progress on the evolution of the economic and social

structure, the links between population and development, and the definition of the role of the United Nations vis-à-vis other specialized institutions, in particular the Bretton Woods institutions, which dealt with the various aspects of development in their particular spheres of competence.

Mr. AL-ONAIZI (Kuwait) welcomed the report of the Secretary-General on an agenda for development (A/48/935) and expressed the hope that the current session of the Council would begin to define practical measures to translate the guiding ideas in the report into action.

He emphasized that development was the principal engine of progress and that its various dimensions - educational, social, economic and political - must focus on the human person. Human development was, even more than the responsibility of States, above all a moral imperative based on religious values and on the relevant international covenants and treaties, in particular since the second World Conference on Human Rights, held in 1993, had enshrined the right to development as an integral part of the fundamental rights of the human person. The guidelines for sustainable development must be defined in the context of the human person, the principal source of wealth, and such development would remain impossible so long as other concerns such as war or the arms race persisted.

For over 30 years, Kuwait had worked to implement development plans with a view to meeting the requirements, and satisfying the fundamental needs, of its people, having set as one of its primary goals the development of Kuwaitis in all areas - educational, social, economic and political.

At the educational level, Kuwait ensured that all members of its society took advantage of the educational options offered to them. At the social level, the family should constitute the principal pillar of society, and it was therefore important that development plans should be oriented towards the interests and protection of the family. At the economic level, meeting the basic needs of the individual was the essential condition not only of his development, but of his very humanity, an idea which should transcend geographic and political boundaries to include the entire population of the planet. Lastly, at the political level, the implementation of democracy and the participation of the entire society in decision-making were of the greatest importance.

While it agreed with the content of the Secretary-General's report on an agenda for development, Kuwait wished to emphasize the following points:

First, it was important to remove the obstacles to the transfer of new scientific technologies for peaceful purposes, setting aside all political or economic considerations.

Second, the United Nations should intervene more effectively in favour of exchanges of experimental data and scientists between developing countries and economically advanced ones, regardless of the developing countries' ability to pay, in order that scientific and technological exchanges should be open to everyone for the benefit of all mankind.

Third, the United Nations should organize regional training courses on evaluating the effective productivity of workers, with a view to reducing the concealed unemployment that existed in all societies.

Fourth, it was important to promote the international exchange of research, experimental data, and experts in the realm of practical and vocational training.

Fifth, in the area of education, it was essential that each country should adopt legislation instituting compulsory education, seek to ensure that education was free of charge at all levels, and set up education and training programmes focusing on human rights and all aspects of development with a view to instilling those values and ideas in everyone, since the development of societies, too, began with the development of the individual.

Sixth, it was important to encourage direct cooperation among countries, under the auspices of the World Health Organization, with a view to improving health in developing countries.

Seventh and last, means of direct communication must be established between the local authorities and local groups responsible for environmental protection and the relevant international organizations, and ways must be found to provide the necessary information and to give everyone, without distinction, access to that information.

Exchange of views

Mr. MACHIN (United Kingdom) said that the debate should serve to bring about recognition at the highest political level of the role of the United Nations in economic and social development, and to more closely define that role, before agreement was reached on themes and directions such as the

environment, matters relating to health and the world population, the participation of women in development, and the particular problems of Africa and the less developed countries. He felt that the Organization should engage in a dialogue with all the players in development, from governmental authorities to non-governmental organizations (NGOs). They all played a crucial role, whether they provided development financing or, like the NGOs, they implemented community programmes and projects aimed at the poorest members of society.

The Organization's task, which was necessarily a modest one, was to respond, at the request of countries, to needs which had not been satisfied in certain areas where the United Nations was better equipped and more effective than other entities. It was important to build on the progress already achieved, however limited (reform of executive boards of programmes and funds), and to pursue that course. Instead of creating new mechanisms, it would be better to ensure that the existing ones functioned effectively.

While his delegation agreed with the President that the intergovernmental framework, like political will, played a crucial role in United Nations development activities, those activities must be directed towards the field. In that area, significant progress had been made as a result of resolution 47/199, which provided the necessary instruments for effective assistance. The National Strategy Note, in particular, if used correctly, would make it possible to achieve true coordination of activities and, it was to be hoped, sustained development. It was also important to note the strengthening of the role of the resident coordinator.

Mr. BOEHMER (Germany) noted that the five dimensions of development defined by the Secretary-General in his report appeared to have received wide support. If so, the operational agencies, at both the national level and that of the United Nations system, would have a solid foundation for future action. With regard to the proposal of the Executive Director of the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), to the effect that all official development assistance (ODA), should be channelled through the United Nations, he felt that bilateral cooperation would continue to play a key role. Many governments, including that of Germany, emphasized the principle of subsidiarity, which presupposed that multilateral bodies and national policies and programmes were complementary and supportive. With regard to the role of the international financial institutions, he pointed out that the Development Committee of the International

Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, which included 178 Member States of the Organization, had created a working group to examine the future role of those institutions.

Mr. MONGBE (Benin) said that an agenda for development already existed in the various international instruments, which answered the questions raised regarding the unique role of the United Nations and the roles of the Bretton Woods institutions, national programmes and the private sector. The debate should therefore focus on practical matters. What was currently lacking was good coordination at the United Nations level, ensured by a coordinating body such as the Economic and Social Council, for example, and political will on the part of all the actors, focusing on the five pillars of development proposed by the Secretary-General.

With regard to the role of the international financial institutions, many delegations had been disappointed by the answers given by the heads of those institutions, who, while referring to the permanent state of flux of the resources made available to developing countries, had not made any useful proposals concerning indebtedness, relations between the United Nations and the Bretton Woods institutions, or the role of the Economic and Social Council in coordinating the activities and gaining the cooperation of those institutions.

With regard to the possible establishment of a new body, there again, Benin felt that the elements already existed. What was cruelly lacking was the will of States, particularly the developed countries, to respect the commitments made by common accord, and because of that lack of will the developing countries continued to sink deeper into underdevelopment.

The PRESIDENT observed that in order for the relationship between the United Nations and the international financial institutions to evolve, it was necessary to examine the credibility and soundness of the decisions taken by the United Nations with regard to the Bretton Woods institutions, which had their own mandate.

Mr. LAMAMRA (Algeria) said that at the current stage of the debate, it was merely a question of identifying points of view; it would be premature to undertake negotiations on an agenda for development, since the Secretary-General's report was only preliminary. As Chairman of the Group of 77, and unlike some other delegations, he did not support the five pillars of development proposed by the Secretary-General, which he considered too abstract.

The Secretary-General's report (A/48/935) did not sufficiently emphasize the problem of financing, whereas everyone knew that there could be no development without a massive influx of resources, whether of local origin (public and private funds) or international origin.

Furthermore, the relationship between peace and development must be strengthened. Indeed, although development had an impact on peace, it should nevertheless be considered on its own merits rather than as a corollary to operations aimed at maintaining international peace and security. Development and peace should go together and be placed on an equal footing. With regard to social justice, the question arose as to whether it was really an objective of development or rather a means to that end. Algeria also believed that the proper management of public affairs must be resituated in its proper context, rather than being isolated from the internal situation of each country and the mobilization of all its capacities. That aspect of an agenda for development must therefore be examined when the question of the role of the actors in development was considered.

His delegation, like that of Benin, believed that existing agreements and arrangements had established sufficient consensus with respect to development. The role of an agenda for development would therefore be to forge a link between the existing theoretical and political consensus and its actual implementation by striving to avoid duplication of effort and waste of resources. It was regrettable that the Secretary-General's report had not bridged that gap. Algeria therefore hoped that the new report to be submitted to the General Assembly at its forty-ninth session would include the operational dimension which was currently lacking.

In his opinion, the objectives defined in the Secretary-General's report were too modest and an agenda for development should formulate ambitious strategic goals such as the elimination of poverty, rather than its mere reduction, the elimination of hunger, the attainment of food security, the creation of full employment goals which had been embodied in the Charter of the United Nations 50 years previously. Furthermore, agreement should be reached on the type of effective partnership which should be forged for development. Such a partnership, rather than being between donor and recipient countries, would involve partners who, while holding different points of view, would still share equal responsibilities. The agenda for development should also examine further

the crucial question of resources - official development assistance, direct investment, debt, innovative sources of financing. It should thus, for example, forcefully reaffirm the goals for official development assistance set 25 years earlier but not yet attained and establish a schedule for their implementation.

Concerning the institutional aspect of the United Nations role, he said that, instead of creating new bodies, it was better to improve existing bodies and to make the ongoing economic and social reforms promoted by the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council operational.

In order to be complete, the report on an agenda for development should outline the role of the different national and international development agents, both public and private, and explain the contribution all agencies could make to United Nations development activities in the interests of streamlining and efficiency.

Mr. SPETH (United Nations Development Programme) noted that in promoting development, which was one of its primary objectives, the United Nations now had many important assets with which to tackle the diverse problems arising from worsening underdevelopment and from inequality between the richest and poorest countries. While the United Nations had fulfilled its unique role in the economic sphere by promoting market liberalization and privatization, it had perhaps not accorded sufficient attention to the social impact of economic policies, the elimination of poverty, the environment, the conservation of natural resources and good governance. That did not mean, however, that it should restrict its action to a small number of areas; rather, in order to address the major macroeconomic problems, it must undertake radical reforms aimed at mobilizing and fully utilizing its considerable executing capacity in the field of aid and development.

It was paradoxical that, even as lessons were beginning to be drawn from the experience of the "lost" decade of the 1980s, and even as the United Nations marshalled its resources to promote development, official development assistance in general and United Nations resources in particular were declining, and the resources available to the United Nations were being increasingly used to redress emergency situations instead of to finance longer-term development programmes. Should that disquieting trend persist, the result in the long run would be a proliferation of worsening situations of the kind which efforts should be made to prevent rather than cure. It was therefore time to sound the

alarm so as to reverse that trend and to endow the United Nations with the financial resources required to meet the growing need for development cooperation that it was today in a good position to satisfy.

Mr. HAMBURGER (Netherlands) said that the Secretary-General's report did not need to be modified and that the five dimensions of development proposed in that report deserved the Council's endorsement, with due account being taken of the particular situation in each country. However, concise operational guidelines must be adopted to supplement the report. Such guidelines could be included in the addendum which the Secretary-General intended to submit to the General Assembly at its forty-ninth session. The guidelines should be addressed not only to the United Nations but also to all development actors - Governments, non-governmental organizations and the private sector - and must include well-defined priorities. They should be based on the five dimensions as well as on Agenda 21, the International Development Strategy, the Cartagena Commitment and the future programme of action of the International Conference on Population and Development, since the question of population had not received the attention it deserved in the Secretary-General's report. At the institutional level, the guidelines should propose major new reforms aimed especially at remedying the very considerable weaknesses of the United Nations in terms of decision-making. They could be based on such earlier Netherlands proposals as the establishment of a social/economic/environmental chamber within the Security Council at a high political level, the merger of certain international and intergovernmental agencies dealing in particular with food, trade and the environment, the creation of a mechanism for consultations between the United Nations and the main actors of the world economy (enterprises, employers and employees) and the maximum decentralization of development activities to the lowest level - national, subregional or regional.

Mr. HORIGUCHI (Japan) said that it was important not to overlook such intersectoral questions as the relationship between peace and development, the relationship between military expenditure and development, the development of human resources and capacity-building together with such world-wide issues as the environment and population. In his opinion, the United Nations was remarkably well-placed to lead a world-wide effort in those and other areas. For 50 years, it had known success and failure. The failures seemed to be attributable not so much to shortcomings in its organizational structure as to a

lack of political will. In any event, it was pointless to create new bodies unless there was the necessary political will. In that connection, the United Nations needed support from all actors, including Governments, the media, non-governmental organizations and the people, in order to be able to act. Concerning the unique role of the United Nations, his delegation was surprised by the statement of the Executive Director of the United Nations Population Fund to the effect that following the end of the cold war all official development assistance should be channelled through the United Nations. That suggestion was all the more surprising in that it had been made by a senior official of the United Nations who, being well acquainted with the facts, should have been more circumspect.

Mr. AWAAD (Egypt) said that developing countries needed assistance in order to bring about sustainable development and overcome the vicious circle of economic backwardness and that providing such assistance was the purpose of development programmes. In order to be efficient, development programmes must be constantly reviewed by the donor countries, given that their shortcomings were not always attributable to the structural weaknesses of the recipient countries.

As far as Egypt was concerned, there was no need to explain the United Nations development role any further as it was very clearly delineated in the Charter of the United Nations. All that needed to be done was to ensure that the United Nations played the full role assigned to it and not only its role in the area of international peace and security. During the cold war its role had been based on its mandate under Chapter VII of the Charter, but it was now able to act in the economic and social fields as well. Some thought must also be given to the Organization's contribution to macroeconomic development, which was minimal when compared to that of the Bretton Woods institutions. However, he had some reservations about establishing an economic security council. Indeed, when developing countries called for the establishment of a body to deal with an issue which was of direct interest to them, such as desertification or export diversification, they were told to make the best possible use of existing machinery. The same argument held true for the current case. What was lacking was not new institutions but rather resources. There was a huge gap between the needs of developing countries and the resources that developed countries were prepared to devote to development. Without financing, the agenda for

development would become yet another item on the long list of international instruments on which action was still pending.

Ms. DIOP (Senegal) said that the outline of the plan resulting from the President's questions was completely arbitrary. Indeed, the fact that the United Nations role in development was still being examined even though the Charter had defined that role 50 years previously amounted to failure and such failure was attributable to the lack of technical and financial resources and the necessary political will. In her delegation's opinion, the blame should be directed at developed countries, as they controlled the world, instead of at the international financial institutions, which were often the scapegoats. Such failure might not have occurred had the management of the United Nations been entrusted to women instead of men 50 years previously. Moreover, the commitments undertaken by both developed and developing countries had not been fulfilled. In order to be of genuine assistance, the developed countries must stop being selfish and must honour their financial, technical and other commitments. For their part, the developing countries must strive to give development a human face and to teach people how to undertake their own development.

Mr. CUI (China) said that the United Nations and the Bretton Woods institutions were uniquely equipped to play their assigned roles in development. It was undeniable that the United Nations had been unable to meet all the expectations of Member States, hence the need to formulate an agenda for development. The Bretton Woods institutions were not above criticism either, although they had made a valuable contribution to development. He agreed with the President that the United Nations was in a unique position by virtue of its universality and its Charter. That was why it should reflect the political will and consensus of Member States and play an advisory role vis-à-vis other international organizations, including the international funding agencies. Decision-making should also be democratic and fair. As far as the role of the United Nations in policy-making was concerned, many countries had noted with concern that social and environmental considerations had been introduced into the multilateral trading system. It was a problem that should be addressed by the international community and the World Trade Organization. Concerning the types of relations or mechanisms that needed to be established in order to address the problem of the increasing multipolarization of the world, he

wondered whether such relations should be based on cold-war ideology, the interests of some privileged countries or on a sound, sustainable and equitable world economy. In any case, all the efforts would come to naught without more efficiency, a better division of labour, greater popular participation and increased transparency.

Ms. VOLKOFF (Canada) said that the nature of an agenda for development should be examined in order to know whether it should focus on general ideas, on priorities or on actions and whether the United Nations alone was to be entrusted with the task of implementing it. While it was possible to reach agreement on broad ideas, such as the five dimensions of development, it was more difficult to agree on priorities unless such priorities concerned regions or groups of countries that shared the same concerns. If an agenda for development was envisaged in terms of actions, the problem which arose was that of execution, for which either the United Nations or the different actors must be responsible. If an agenda for development was to be geared to the United Nations, the functional differences between United Nations bodies must be examined in view of the specific role to be played by the United Nations in activities that did not require operational financing but involved policy-making or information-gathering functions. It must be concluded that, with its various levels, an agenda for development was aimed at different actors, and that situation could create some confusion.

Mr. DELACROIX (France) said that he wondered how the United Nations development policy should be targeted. There were considerable economic differences between developing countries, some of which were dynamic actors mobilizing the bulk of international capital while others remained on the periphery of development. Official development assistance and both North-South and South-South solidarity should focus on the latter group of countries. Moreover, while there appeared to be agreement concerning the five dimensions of development proposed by the Secretary-General, one could nevertheless wonder whether the United Nations had the capacity to deal with those five dimensions with equal effectiveness. While it undoubtedly had experience in such areas as the relationship between peace and development, crisis management, humanitarian assistance, social justice and the environment, it must be acknowledged that such macroeconomic issues as the economy, finance, trade and indebtedness were better handled elsewhere. There was obviously a need for a division of labour,

which called for enhanced complementarity between the United Nations, the Bretton Woods institutions and the other organizations and for informal machinery.

France had reservations concerning the establishment of a new body, particularly an economic security council.

As far as official development assistance was concerned, France hoped that it would be focused on four main objectives: consensus-building, coordination, the on-site strengthening of projects and programmes and the gathering, analysis and evaluation of information. The United Nations was well equipped to discharge the latter function, which was vital and must not be overlooked in the conclusions of the debate.

Ms. WAZIR ALI (Pakistan) said that the developing countries expected the United Nations to implement a genuine plan of action with respect to development because it could and must play a leading role in that area. In order to attain the two paramount objectives of peace and development, it could, on the one hand, reform its structure and, on the other hand, mobilize additional financial resources by requesting all countries, and especially the developed world, to devote more resources to development.

In that connection, since developing countries had been required to implement structural adjustment programmes, developed countries must also be requested to implement adjustment programmes to enable them to release, for the purposes of development, a portion of the resources that they devoted to arms, to reduce the debt of developing countries, to increase official development assistance, inter alia by effectively devoting 0.7 per cent of their gross national product to the financing of official development assistance, and to establish an equitable trading system. In other words, the commitments of developed countries with respect to economic cooperation and development must be translated into reality through the establishment of new North-South economic relations in which the role of developed countries and their ties with recipient developing countries were redefined. In that context, the real question was how to endow the United Nations with the means to bring about that radical change while ensuring that developing countries could select their own pattern of development. It was high time for the few privileged countries that controlled the international economic order to cooperate closely with the United Nations and work for the development of all countries.

No new development body was required: all that was needed was a restructuring of existing bodies that would streamline their activities. In that context, the Security Council's mandate should perhaps be reformulated and enlarged to cover economic and social security.

Mr. CAVALCANTI (Brazil) said he agreed with the representative of Algeria that the Council's role was not to establish an agenda for development but to consider the report of the Secretary-General (A/48/935) and to make proposals with a view to its revision. In that connection, he hoped that the Secretary-General would consider the ideas put forward during the current discussion and also the policy documents established by other multilateral agencies which dealt with questions related to an agenda for development.

The Secretary-General's report seemed to have led the members of the Council, in their discussions, to place undue emphasis on the non-economic aspects of development. The order of priorities should be reversed in favour of economic development (and especially the means of achieving it, in particular trade, technology transfer and financial flows) as the springboard for development in the wider sense, inasmuch as it generated resources that could be used to solve a great number of problems.

Mrs. DEMPSKI (United States of America) felt that a general consensus had emerged regarding the five dimensions of development discussed in chapter II of the Secretary-General's report. In addition, several delegations of both developed and developing countries had stressed the key role of women in development and the linkage between population and development. In the course of the debate on the agenda, it was important to examine how those two aspects could be reflected in the individual sections of chapter II of the Secretary-General's report. Lastly, a framework of action to serve as a road-map for activities on the ground should be elaborated, taking as a model the basic documents prepared by other bodies such as the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, the Vienna World Conference on Human Rights and other forthcoming conferences and summits.

Mr. SINGH (India), associating himself with the statement by the representative of Algeria, said that the agenda for development proposed in the Secretary-General's report (A/48/935) did not enjoy the unanimous support of delegations since it failed to meet the expectations of most countries, which had hoped for a more action-oriented document. Moreover, there was a risk, in

placing undue emphasis on peace, social justice, democracy and the protection of the environment, that the achievement of those important goals might be used by the developed countries as a precondition for the granting of economic and financial assistance to the developing countries.

Mr. KELLOWAY (Australia) noted that three basic concerns had been expressed during the debate: first, the debate had failed to produce concrete results; secondly, the share of the United Nations in official development assistance seemed to be declining; and thirdly, the United Nations seemed to be unable to influence macroeconomic policies.

With regard to the first point, he observed that although the agenda for development proposed in the Secretary-General's report was of a universal character and hence somewhat abstract (indeed the same could be said of the United Nations mandate in the area of development), that did not constitute an obstacle since it was at country level that important decisions would and should be taken with all the requisite flexibility. In other words, the agenda would inevitably deal with general aims and policy options, leaving individual countries free to act as appropriate in the light of their own problems, taking responsibility for their own decisions.

With regard to the second point, it was a fact that certain United Nations organizations had disappointed a number of countries, both beneficiaries and donors, which could account for the decline in the share of the United Nations in official development assistance. It had to be said in defence of those organizations that both developing and industrialized countries had undergone major changes over the past 20 years, a circumstance that had not facilitated their task. In particular, they had been accused of failing to adapt quickly enough to cultural change and of not being sufficiently open. On the other hand, some organizations had faced up to their shortcomings and were doing their utmost to redress the situation.

With regard to the third point, it had to be borne in mind that the organizations of the United Nations system did not have the same economic mandate as the Bretton Woods institutions and could not pursue the same course of action for fear of duplication of efforts. Their action, on a more practical level, consisted in offering their services to the countries in which they operated and not in influencing their macroeconomic policies.

Mr. BOUCHER (World Bank) said that the agenda for development dealt with essential, basic issues and that there was no need for a new world economic blueprint. In that regard, the World Bank shared the view expressed by the Secretary-General at the forty-eighth session of the General Assembly. Many components of the agenda, in particular the primacy of national policy and the priority accorded to human resources development, were consonant with the work being done by the Bank.

With regard to the criticism that had been and continued to be levelled against structural adjustment programmes, the Bank had drawn the necessary conclusions and changed its programmes accordingly. It was also fully involved in the activities being undertaken by the organizations of the United Nations system under Agenda 21. With regard to coordination between the Bank and those organizations, relations between which were governed by an agreement dating from 1946, further progress was necessary but considerable headway had already been made on the ground, especially at country level.

If the Bank's lending conditions were sometimes considered very harsh, it was because it could not afford the luxury of running financial risks. However, the Bank was not averse to criticism; it was best to channel such criticism through the ministers of finance and planning and the offices with which the Bank operated. Lastly, the Bank had adopted a policy of transparency and systematically solicited feedback on its work.

Mr. AYEWAH (Nigeria) said that the agenda should be given a specific content and thrust and that a list of priorities should be established. In addition, patterns of world consumption would have to be redefined to preserve the environment and to take account of the needs of individual countries. Only then could Governments accept multilateralism as an instrument of growth and development.

There was no call for the creation of a new body responsible for development; the Economic and Social Council, as a multilateral organ established under the Charter, had the necessary means to achieve a consensus on development issues. It could, in particular, encourage representatives to put pressure on their Governments to meet their commitments. The wasteful proliferation of administrative bodies should be avoided.

With regard to development finance, the Bretton Woods institutions had certainly contributed to the development of all countries by funding programmes

that had enhanced the well-being of populations all over the world. But they had to understand that it was unrealistic to prescribe identical remedies for countries whose structures, resources and economic situation often had nothing in common. They would therefore do well to modify their structural adjustment programmes and review their lending conditions. Moreover, the Bretton Woods institutions should not see themselves as rivals of the United Nations organizations and should cooperate with them to create an active partnership for development. Lastly, official development assistance, one of the components of development finance, should be collected and distributed multilaterally, and the Economic and Social Council should encourage the members of the international community to take steps in that direction.

The CHAIRMAN said that the dialogue of the past two days was part of a process that had been under way for some time and would continue. The next stage in the process would be the consideration by the General Assembly of the agenda for development on the basis of a new report by the Secretary-General which would contain specific recommendations that were not included in document A/48/935. The conclusions of the Chairman on the high-level debate would be set forth in the Council's report on the proceedings of its substantive session.

The meeting rose at 9.15 p.m.